Vol. IX, No. 42 HUMAN EVENTS October 15, 1952

TIME FOR SECESSION

By FRANK CHODOROV

IF I WERE GOVERNOR OF A STATE, or even a legislator, I would put my weight behind a secessionist movement; not secession from the Union, but secession from Washington. I would do so exactly because I favor the Union, as originally conceived; and my advocacy of secession would be based on the same reasoning that prompted initiation of the Union, namely that divided authority is a good guarantee of freedom.

The Union was — it still exists on paper — a voluntary association of autonomous states, each invested with all the political authority not specifically assigned to the federal government. Outside these limitations, the federal government could not go, while state authority was restricted only by the Constitution. This neat political package is being clawed at by the power-mad denizens of the cocktail capital of the country, simply because so long as it remains intact, no matter how damaged, they cannot achieve their ultimate purpose of complete centralization; and the American citizen has some hope of avoiding a regime of absolutism.

The importance of bolstering the Union concept looms large when we consider how far centralization has gone, in the economic field. Through the instrument of taxation, one-third of our economy has already been centralized. Through subsidies and regulation, our industrial plant is virtually operating on the fascist pattern of private ownership under federal control; outright confiscation waits only upon the excuse of war. Through involvement of our financial institutions in its fiscal schemes, the government has, for all practical purposes, reduced them to mere agencies of the United States Treasury. Through labor legislation presumably intended to favor the worker, union leaders are able to ride herd on our basic industries, and the nationalization of labor can be effected by simply drafting these leaders into the government.

Politically, however, the drive toward centralization is handicapped by the residue of power still remaining in the state governments. This fact was recognized by the maniacs of centralization who invaded Washington early in the New Deal era. Promptly, Mr. Roosevelt's notorious Temporary National Economic Council proposed the division of the country into ten "administrative" units. With the usual double-talk, the TNEC denied any intention to circumvent the Constitution, but argued the impossibility of carrying out "national programs" under the handicap of divided authority.

The unlikelihood of getting the states to vote themselves out of existence turned the centralizers to other means, such as bribing the state authorities with patronage, alienating

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the loyalty of the citizenry with federal subsidies, establishing within the states independent administrative bodies for the management of federal works programs. It will be noted that these management bodies are called "authorities" — and that they are, in fact, set up to take care of political matters coincident to their other functions. The current urgency for FEPC, with its promise of using federal troops for the enforcement of the law, is in line with the policy of liquidating the autonomy of the states.

The centralizers know their history. Wherever absolutism got going, the liquidation of home rule prepared the way. A half century before Hitler, Bismarck had cleared the road for him by wiping out the independent German states. Cavour did as much for Mussolini in Italy. The Czars made the advent of Stalin easy. Centralization is the antithesis of home rule, and the dualism written into our Constitution is an assurance, so long as it remains in effect, that Washington will have trouble in achieving Moscow.

THE FIRST STEP I would take, if I were governor of a state, would be to require every school child to become familiar with the history and theory of what we call states' rights, but which is really the doctrine of home rule. For, it was precisely the fear of centralization, such as we are now faced with, that prompted the Founding Fathers to write that doctrine into our basic law.

It must be remembered that the early American had had his fill of far-off government. Having got rid of it at the cost of war he was dead set against a native version of London rule. He knew he had to have some kind of central government — to deal with foreign governments, to prevent the component commonwealths from setting up trade barriers between themselves, and several other matters that could not be handled by local government — but he wanted it severely restricted in scope. The only kind of Constitution he would accept was one that clearly delimited the power of the government to be set up under it.

In all other matters he was willing to put his trust in local government. Why? Simply because it was not likely to get out of hand; one could keep one's eyes on it. Besides, being a government of neighbors it was likely to be cognizant of and responsive to the temper of the governed. It is a certainty that the legislator representing Sauk Center, Minnesota, is more fully conversant with the problems of that community than is the Senator from Alabama, and can be trusted not to vote against its interests; on the other hand, the Senator from Alabama has no inhibitions about riding roughshod over the interests of Sauk Center if, in his opinion, these interests run contrary to what he conceives to be to national interest. Then, there is always the possibility of Sauk Center being completely ignored in a tariff deal between the Senators of New York and California.

The extent to which this fear of centralization possessed the early American is illustrated by the story of a point of protocol that came up in the term of President

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington. The "father of his country" was expected in Boston, and Governor Hancock cogitated the propriety of his going to meet the distinguished visitor; would he not be compromising the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by so doing? He settled the problem by pleading illness. The sequel to that story is also illustrative. It was suggested to President Washington that he review the Massachusetts militia, but he rejected the idea because such a review might imply federal interference with the military arm of the state; after all, the tacit understanding in those days was that the militia might be called upon to face the federal army.

In both cases, neither personal idiosyncrasy nor considerations of etiquette were of prime importance. It was the spirit of the times that found expression in these incidents, and the spirit of the times was characterized by a keen jealousy of freedom. The early American knew that freedom was nothing more than the absence of external restraint on behavior; the government could not give you freedom, it could only take it away. And he knew from experience, if not from his reading, that when a government is detached from the governed it invariably strives to take it away. Freedom, then, is in better case when the effective government never gets beyond the purview of the town hall meeting.

That is the truth that needs constant reiteration, now that semantics has found a way to fragment freedom and enumerate the parts. The early American could not have been bamboozled by that verbal sleight-of-hand.

THERE IS a facet of political dualism that needs exploration and exploitation. It is the fact that divided authority introduces competition in government. Political science accepts as an axiom the monopolization of coercion by government; it must have that monopoly, so the axiom runs, in order that it may prevent the indiscriminate use of coercion by citizens. There is no arguing with that point. But, when the individual is free to move from one jurisdiction to another, a limit is put on the extent to which the government may use its monopoly power. Government is held in restraint by the fear of losing its tax-paying citizens, just as loss of customers tends to keep other monopolies from getting too arrogant.

For instance, because our federal government has not yet managed a national divorce law, there is competition between states for that kind of business. Some states try to attract capital by advertising their abstention from inheritance and income taxation, and Nevada's legalization of gambling has to some extent overcome her lack of natural resources and business opportunities. The practice of evading local sales taxes by crossing state borders is a common example of the principle of competition in government.

Before the Sixteenth Amendment got into the Constitution, a number of states instituted income taxes. Though the levies were always small, collection was attended with considerable difficulty; the tax-collectors, being neighbors, not "foreigners" from Washington, were inclined toward leniency, and collusion was not uncommon. Never-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theless, the states that did not tax incomes made that fact known, and the fear of losing industry to them caused a number of states to drop income taxation.

Socialistic experiments did not originate with the New Deal; state governments had their own laboratories long before 1932. Many years ago I saw an idle state-owned cement plant in South Dakota, and early in the depression a Wisconsin law made it obligatory for restaurants to serve two ounces of Wisconsin-made cheese with every meal, whether the diner wanted it or not. The platform of the Farmer-Labor Party, which sprang up around 1920, and captured several states, was larded with socialism. However, every state experiment in socialism failed simply because of the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of movement, for both labor and capital, across state lines. Federal socialism can be made to operate somehow only because there is no escape from its constabulary.

Then there is the point in dualism that the citizen can apply to the federal government for relief when the state government transgresses his constitutional rights. And a state government may bring suit against the federal government. The effect, then, of divided authority is to keep both federal and state governments off balance; neither one has that complete monopoly of power necessary to a regime of absolutism.

WHAT WITH AMENDMENTS to the Constitution, legalistic interpretations and downright circumvention made possible by well-placed subventions, the autonomy of the states has been well watered down. Nevertheless, state lines have not yet been wiped out and there are areas of jurisdiction that are still reserved to the states. These areas can be strengthened and expanded. It is only a matter of intelligent and resolute resistance by the state governments to every scheme, no matter how seemingly innocuous or politically attractive, that emanates from a Washington. If for no other reason, personal pride should prompt every governor and state legislator to take a secessionist attitude; they were not elected to be lackeys of the federal bureaucracy.

Just how far that resistance can go, and remain legal, is a matter for lawyers to determine. But, it is quite obvious that the states can make it difficult for the federal government to extend its spheres of influence by a non-cooperative attitude. Take the federal government's invasion of electric power business under the guise of flood control; it is still necessary for the centralizers to obtain permission from state governments to carry out such schemes, and refusal would go hard with them. Federal tenements, which in practice become enclaves of votes for the party in power, are made possible by exemption from real estate taxes, which is still the prerogative of the local authorities; were exemption regularly refused, the housing bureaucrats would be in a sorry plight. If every grant-in-aid were refused, the federal government would be in the unenviable position of a philanthropist bereft of beggars.

There is no end of trouble the states can give the centralizers by merely refusing to cooperate. Such refusal would meet with popular acclaim if it were supplemented with a campaign of education on the meaning of states' rights, in terms of human freedom. In fact, the educational part of such a secessionist movement should be given first importance. And those who are plumping for a "third party", because both existing parties are centralist in character, would do well to nail to their masthead this banner: Secession of the 48 states from Washington.

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* — FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Volume IX, No. 42 — Wednesday, October 15, 1952 — Washington, D. C.

MINNESOTA RECEIVED OCT 17 1952 UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

The Campaign: Word goes the rounds that some in Ike Headquarters are seeking to persuade MacArthur to give public support to Eisenhower, by speech or released statement.

These Ike workers have been trying to get people who know MacArthur well to go and see the famous General in the Waldorf and to urge him to speak out for the Republican ticket — but so far without any encouraging results. Whether Taft has been approached as an emissary to the Waldorf is not known. But, it is believed that nothing less than a personal call by Ike will avail.

Those who are familiar with the circumstances of the break between Ike and MacArthur many years ago in the Philippines believe that it would be difficult for the General-Candidate to approach his old chief.

Also, some effort is being made to get former President Herbert Hoover to appear on a nation-wide TV broadcast in favor of Ike. It is believed that this prospect has a much better chance of success than the enlisting of General MacArthur in the Eisenhower cause this year.

We can now report on GOP reception of our suggestion of last week, "How Ike Can Win", for a practical step to ensure Ike's capture of the Southern electoral votes. We proposed a deal between GOP Congressional leaders and Southern conservative leaders in Congress, by which seniorities would be merged and chairmanships divided. A high functionary in the GOP National Committee commented that Republican leaders are now too confident of a sweeping victory to consider such an arrangement. We believe their attitude is gravely mistaken. But the results on November 4 will tell the tale.

Bedell Smith: The head of the Central Intelligence Agency has just (October 13) told the House Un-American Activities Committee that President Truman has been doing a good job in eliminating Communists from the Government. That statement is so patently false that newspapers have demanded General Bedell Smith's resignation.

It is high time, and not for the above cause alone. On December 12, 1951, HUMAN EVENTS raised a question about Smith's record. We recalled his deportment at the time of Pearl Harbor, when he was in a key position on the General Staff. The Army Board of inquiry which investigated the Pearl Harbor disaster in 1944 suggested that Smith was far from alert in handling the famous Japanese intercepted messages which should have tipped us off that Japan would soon attack. The Army Board reported that the decoded messages "reached G-2 of the War Department not later than the evening of December 6" and were given to Smith. But Smith did nothing.

"Whatever was the reason of Colonel Smith for not conveying this message to General Marshall on the night of December 6, it was unfortunate", the Board remarked. "This information could have been sent to General Short [Army commander in Hawaii] on the afternoon (Hawaiian time) of December 6." In short, the command in Hawaii could have been alerted in time to stave off the disaster which wrecked the Pacific fleet and killed thousands of men.

This picture raises the question whether, on grounds of efficiency, Smith should be in charge of our key intelligence agency today.

Over Hokkaido: Blundering into war is a dangerous possibility which looms from study of such incidents as that of last week, when a B-36 was apparently shot down by the Russians in the area north

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Japan. The B-36 episode, now made public, is not the only one — there are others which have been kept secret.

We learn on reliable authority that on several occasions in the last month Soviet war planes have been noted flying over Hokkaido, the northern island of Japan, and under our military jurisdiction. On what precise missions these Soviet planes invaded this area our officials can only speculate: for observation? or photography? or to test our reactions? The answer is, "don't know". Anyway no clashes between our aircraft and the Russians occurred. Why the Russians shot our B-36 is not clear — apparently they did not want us to see something which they were anxious to conceal. And that is disturbing.

Such incidents as the B-36 and the mysterious visits of Russian planes are potentially dangerous. A "flick of a stick" in air activities could transform peaceful flying into air combat and precipitate a diplomatic incident pregnant of war.

Kilgore: The incumbent Democratic Senator, Harvey Kilgore, in West Virginia, is being closely pressed by former Senator Revercomb, Republican, in a sharp contest. A few weeks ago, it was assumed that Kilgore would easily win. Now, the picture has changed. What has happened is this: Revercomb has been accusing Kilgore of a long history of sympathy with Communist causes and has brought out a great deal of documentation to prove his claims. Kilgore has failed to answer Revercomb. Newspapers in West Virginia have taken up the matter and printed pieces along the same line as Revercomb's charges. (This kind of attack on Kilgore comes as no surprise to many in Washington, who are familiar with the Senator's record.)

In the past 24 hours, we learn from reliable sources that Revercomb will soon distribute a pamphlet which those who have seen it say is comparable to the brochure which did so much to defeat Senator Claude "Red" Pepper of Florida in 1948.

Meanwhile, according to Willard Edwards writing in the Washington *Times-Herald*, October 13, Kilgore sued a Charleston, West Virginia, newspaper for libel when that publication reprinted charges similar to those of Revercomb. One other paper, a Democratic organ and former supporter of Kilgore, the *Raleigh Register* said editorially, "West Virginians are proud people and will not condone this attempt to make the press knuckle under. An indictment has been made and Kilgore owes an explanation to the people — not an attempt to club the press through the courts." Consequently, Revercomb has made great progress, but needs help. McCarthy and Nixon may make speeches in the state in his behalf. But Stevenson GHQ is sending in shock troops of writers and lecturers to help Kilgore.

In Washington, those who fight the real battle against Communism hope that Revercomb will defeat Kilgore. They point out that if Senator McCarran, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee and prominent foe of Communism, should die (he is 76), the next ranking Democrat is Kilgore who would therefore succeed him. In view of Kilgore's well-known sympathies for the Left, one can imagine what would happen to McCarran's work in such fields as those covered by the Senate Internal Security Committee.

Senate Elections: We must report that a wave of confidence — perhaps over-confidence — has swept the GOP here about the chances of winning the Senate. Early this year, the Party was gloomy, but now hopes revive because of reports of a better showing in a number of states.

Specifically, unexpectedly favorable situations have arisen in a number of states hitherto regarded as surely Democratic. We mentioned above the case of Revercomb vs. Kilgore in West Virginia. Additionally, Congressman Beall, Republican, in Maryland is regarded as having a good chance of defeating George P. Mahoney, Democratic Senatorial candidate in that state. (Incumbent Sen. Herbert O'Conor, Democrat, has retired and Mahoney is trying to hold this seat for the Democrats.) Strong internal convulsions within the Democratic Party in Maryland reportedly have made Beall's campaign easier.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Also, in Wyoming, incumbent Senator Joseph O'Mahoney, Democrat, seems to have worn out his welcome with state voters and Republican Governor Barrett has a better chance of winning against him in the Senatorial race. In Michigan, Democratic incumbent Senator Blair Moody is strongly pressed by Congressman Potter, a popular legless veteran, who is running for the first time for the Senate. Finally, in New Mexico, incumbent Democratic Senator Dennis Chavez is facing formidable opposition from General Patrick Hurley in the Senate contest.

However, the race is reportedly very close for five Republican Senate seats — Cain in Washington, Kem in Missouri, Ecton in Montana, Jenner in Indiana, Lodge in Massachusetts. Summing up, people on Capitol Hill guess that the Republicans may score some surprises, but overall will probably fall short of winning a clear majority.

Class of '46: Among the excellent group of GOP Senators sent to Washington six years ago for their first term and who are now up for re-election is one Senator William Jenner of Indiana, worthy of special notice. We have just run across a fine tribute to the Indianan. Dr. John B. Crane in his column to American newspapers from Frankfurt, Germany, reports on the notes of a German student just escaped from East Germany to the Western zone. The student in his study notes relates how the Communist schools in the East teach that there are six stages in the development of society: primitive system, slavery, feudalism, capitalism, socialism and finally Communism. The Communists suggest to the student that he look with favor on socialism and socialist governments because these prepare the way for Communism.

Dr. Crane remarks: "I have heard Sen. William Jenner in more than one eloquent speech on the floor of the Senate warn that socialism is a step towards Communism and that we must not build up socialism either in Western Europe or at home. His Fair Deal opponents laughed at him." Indeed, this faculty of foresight typifies Jenner, who has the intelligence to perceive long in advance what the danger is and who has the courage to proclaim it on the floor of the Senate.

There are other GOP Senators, now running for re-election, who deserve support. Harry Cain of Washington is waging a gallant fight; like Jenner he espouses unpopular causes, but does not waver. Then there is Jim Kem of Missouri, battling very heavy odds. Kem is a serious, hard working legislator — excellent in his voting record on both foreign and domestic issues, a much more reliable man than his opponent, Mr. Stuart Symington, who served the Fair Deal in Washington. Somewhat like Kem is Zales Ecton of Montana, trying to save his seat from a popular Democratic opponent, Mike Mansfield. We have watched the two for years — Ecton is the one whom conservatives would prefer. In Nevada, George Malone seeks to retain his seat in the Senate against a newcomer Don Mechling, a Democrat. Malone has a good voting record on both domestic and foreign affairs; his strong fight against the dismantling of industry in Germany is remembered. Finally, there is Watkins of Utah, a valiant fighter for a sound foreign policy.

Of the "class of 1946", the above are the ones whose seats are in danger; others have clearer sailing. Hugh Butler, a fine Senator, is a sure winner for re-election in Nebraska. McCarthy is "in", in Wisconsin. Williams is a probable winner in Delaware as a result of his fine exposures of corruption. Bricker, an excellent colleague of Taft, is given the edge in Ohio. Martin, a sound legislator, is regarded as "safe" in Pennsylvania.

In Nebraska, some Republicans may vote for a Democrat against the Republican senatorial candidate (for the two-year term), Dwight Griswold. The Democratic candidate is William Ritchie of Omaha, who has unfurled a domestic and foreign policy program that would satisfy the most exacting followers of Senator Robert A. Taft. Griswold has a record of supporting the "one world" philosophy and did work abroad for the Democratic Administration six years ago after his defeat by Sen. Hugh Butler for the Senate nomination.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Communists, But: The law bounced out of their jobs a half dozen New York City school teachers because of their presumptive Communistic leanings. Since he who pays the fiddler has a right to call the tunes, the action of the Board of Education is not to be quarrelled with. We quarrel, however, with the law because it does not define Communism, so that the taxpayers of New York might know why a teacher who adheres to it is not a proper teacher of children.

For instance, the basic tenet of Communism is the denial of private property. If that is what the law disagrees with, then all who teach it, whether or not they admit their affinity with Communism, ought not to be allowed to teach in public schools. Yet, there is evidence that not only teachers but even the makers of law are in agreement that the individual has no absolute right to property, that ownership is not an unqualified evil; in fact, the State asserts its prior right to all that is produced, as witness, income taxation. If all who teach this priority of the State are to be disqualified, who would teach? (What textbooks would be used?)

Communism also denies the doctrine of natural rights, as well as the God from Whom the doctrine maintains these rights are derived. This is in agreement with the teachings of John Dewey, which have had a great influence on pedagogy. Is a Deweyite a Communist? If so, then hardly a teacher in the New York schools is exempt from disqualification — if the law is logical. For, we do not know of a pedagogical school in the country (except, perhaps, those of the Catholic faith), which denies Deweyism.

The failure of the law to define Communism causes us much more chagrin than the fate of the half dozen Communist teachers.

Book Front: It is rumored that General Marshall's reputation will suffer as a result of the publication of a forthcoming book by Admiral Ernest J. King, famous commander of World War II. The book which will be published by W. W. Norton & Company is entitled *Fleet Admiral King, a Naval Record,* by the Admiral and Walter Muir Whitehill.

As a matter of fact, one chapter from the book has just appeared in the October issue of the Proceedings of the U. S. Naval Institute. In this excerpt from the book, the famous leader of our Navy in the last war has some severe things to say about the Pearl Harbor disaster. "He (King) felt", so runs the Institute journal, "that the Roberts Commission had not reached the heart of the matter, but merely produced scapegoats to satisfy the popular demand for fixing the responsibility for the Pearl Harbor debacle. It had seemed to him that Admiral Kimmel and General Short had been sacrificed to political expedience." (The Roberts Commission was headed by Supreme Court Justice Owen Roberts and reported in 1942.)

King was aroused by the shelving of Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations and, therefore, together with General Marshall one of the principal characters in the Pearl Harbor drama. King interpreted Stark's shelving in 1942 as a high level move to make Stark a "scapegoat" for the Hawaiian disaster. He regarded Stark's position as involving less responsibility for the safety of Pearl Harbor than that held by Chief of Staff General George C. Marshall. "By arrangement of many years standing", writes Admiral King, "the Army was responsible for the land defense of the Hawaiian Islands, including the security of Pearl Harbor and ships in port there."

The Naval Institute article proceeds to comment: "King had never been able to reconcile the difference in the President's treatment of Admiral Stark and General Marshall in regard to Pearl Harbor." In short, why was Stark made a scapegoat instead of Marshall?

52 Reminders: When you are thinking of gifts for Christmas, think of HUMAN EVENTS. It's a gift that repeats itself 52 times. Watch for special offer.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED